



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,916	12/14/2004	Allard Arend Boomkens	NL 020559	8865
24737	7590	03/23/2006		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
			EXAMINER CORNELIO, GINA N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2879	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/517,916

Applicant(s)

BOOMKENS ET AL.

Examiner

Gina N. Cornelio

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 7-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuebler (US 2,680,236).

With respect to claim 1, Kuebler discloses a capped electric lamp comprising: a light transmitting lamp vessel (Figure 1, ref. 1) accommodating an electric element (Figure 1, ref. 7); a lamp cap (Figure 1, ref. 3) provided with a projecting contact pin (Figure 1, ref. 4) having a longitudinal axis, which lamp is secured to the lamp vessel; a current supply conductor which is connected to the electrical element and to the contact pin (Figure 2, ref. 6); an indentation (Figure 2, ref. 11) being formed in the contact pin to fix the current supply conductor, characterized in that: the indentation comprises a weakening portion (Figure 2, ref. 12) for weakening the current supply conductor during the manufacture of the electric lamp and comprises a fixation portion (Figure 2, ref. 16; Col. 4, lines 71-74) for fixing the current supply conductor in the contact pin; and the weakening portion and the fixation portion of the indentation are substantially parallel (Figure 2, ref. 12, 16; Col. 8, lines 22-23).

With respect to claim 2, Kuebler discloses a capped electric lamp as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the indentation between the weakening portion and the fixation portion comprises a narrow portion which is relatively narrow compared with the weakening portion and the fixation portion (Col. 15, lines 34-36).

Art Unit: 2879

With respect to claim 3, Kuebler discloses a capped electric lamp as claimed in claim 2, characterized in that the narrow portion lies in a plane which also comprises the weakening portion and the fixation portion (Figure 2, ref. 12, 16; Col. 8, lines 22-23).

With respect to claim 10, Kuebler discloses a capped electric lamp as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the lamp has two lamp caps which are each provided with two contact pins (Figure 1, ref. 4, 4'; Col. 4, lines 37-40).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuebler (US 2,680,236).

With respect to claim 7; Kuebler discloses the claimed invention except for expressly disclosing that the fixation length of the current supply conductor in the contact pin is at least 0.75mm. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to specify that the fixation length of the current supply conductor in the contact pin of Kuebler be at least 0.75mm, since applicant has not disclosed that this length solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the length being 0.75mm.

Claims 8, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuebler in view of Van Duivendijk et al (US 6,465,960).

Art Unit: 2879

With respect to claim 8, Kuebler discloses a capped electric lamp as claimed in claim 1 (see 102 rejection above), but does not expressly disclose that the current supply conductor in the contact pin does not extend beyond a boundary of the indentation that is furthest removed from the lamp cap. Van Duivendijk, from the same field of endeavor, discloses that the current supply conductor in the contact pin does not extend beyond a boundary of the indentation that is furthest removed from the lamp cap (Van Duivendijk, Col. 1, lines 61-64). At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to shorten the current supply conductor of Kuebler to ensure that it does not extend beyond a boundary of the indentation that is furthest removed from the lamp cap. The motivation for doing so would have been to avoid the increase in safety measures that must be taken when the projecting end of the electric conductor must be removed (Van Duivendijk, Col. 1, lines 48-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kuebler with Van Duivendijk for the benefit of eliminating additional safety measures.

With respect to claim 9, Kuebler discloses a capped electric lamp as claimed in claim 1 (see 102 rejection above), but does not expressly disclose that the contact pin has only one indentation. Van Duivendijk, from the same field of endeavor, discloses that the contact pin has only one indentation (Van Duivendijk, Figure 1, ref. 15; Col. 3, lines 22-23). At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to eliminate one of the indentations in the contact pin of Kuebler. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the weakening and fixation portions to be created in a single motion (Van Duivendijk, Col. 3, lines 23-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kuebler with Van Duivendijk for the benefit of eliminating manufacturing time, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

With respect to claim 11, Kuebler discloses a capped electric lamp as claimed in claim 1 (see 102 rejection above), but does not expressly disclose that the lamp vessel encloses a

Art Unit: 2879

discharge space provided with a filling of mercury and an inert gas in a gastight manner; and the electric element comprises an electrode arranged in the discharge space for maintaining a discharge in the discharge space. Van Duivendijk, from the same field of endeavor, discloses that the lamp vessel encloses a discharge space provided with a filling of mercury and an inert gas in a gastight manner; and the electric element comprises an electrode arranged in the discharge space for maintaining a discharge in the discharge space (Van Duivendijk, Col. 8, lines 1-7). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the lamp of Kuebler to be a low-pressure mercury vapor discharge lamp. The motivation for doing so would have been because mercury is the primary component for efficiently generating ultraviolet light (Van Duivendijk, Col. 1, lines 27-30). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine Kuebler with Van Duivendijk for the benefit of an efficient ultraviolet lamp, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 4-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 4 would be allowable because the prior art does not disclose that the ratio of the width of the narrow portion ( $w_{np}$ ) to the width of the weakening portion ( $w_p$ ) complies with the relation:  $0.2 \leq w_{np}/w_p \leq 0.5$ .

Claim 5 would be allowable because the prior art does not disclose that the ratio of the width of the narrow portion ( $w_{np}$ ) to the width of the fixation portion ( $w_{fp}$ ) complies with the relation:  $0.2 \leq w_{np}/w_{fp} \leq 0.5$ .

Art Unit: 2879

Claim 6 would be allowable because the prior art does not disclose that the ratio of the diameter  $d_{ind}$  of the current supply conductor in the location of the weakening portion in the indentation to the diameter  $d_w$  of the current supply conductor complies with the relation:  $0.2 \leq d_{ind} / d_w \leq 0.5$ .


### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gina N. Cornelio whose telephone number is (571) 272-8978. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 4:30 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gina N Cornelio  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2879  
G.N.C.  
GNC

  
NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800